UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,379	08/15/2001	Christian Kropf	2006-219/H03763	8884
55495 PAUL & PAUI	7590 08/19/200	9	EXAMINER	
2000 MARKET	T STREET	ROBERTS, LEZAH		
Suite 2900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3229			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Occurrence	09/868,379	KROPF ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEZAH W. ROBERTS	1612	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <i>08 Ju</i>	ne 2009		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merit	s is
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i>			0 10
		0 0.0.2.0.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 8,9,13-16 and 20-25 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 8,9,13-16 and 20-25 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of the	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/2009.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed in the Request for Continued Examination on June 8, 2009, have been fully considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 - Obviousness (Previous Rejection)

Claims 8, 9, 13-16 and 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudin et al. (US 6,919,070) in view of Bagchi et al. (US 5,560,932). The rejection is maintained.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues the hydroxyapatite disclosed by Rudin et al. is pure hydroxyapatite crystals whereas the components of the instant invention have a water-soluble protective coating. Therefore the reference does not disclose Applicant's claimed suspension. The process of making the particles is different from the process used to make the particles of Bagchi et al. The process of the instant claims results in

Art Unit: 1612

colloids forming intermolecular cross-linkages. The particles of Bagchi et al are essentially free of intermolecular cross-linkages.

Examiner's Response

Applicant appears to be arguing the references separately and not as combined teachings. Although the hydroxyapatite of Rudin are pure hydroxyapatite, the teachings of Bagchi et al. would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to coat the hydroxyapatite to inhibit aggregation due to inter-particle attractive forces. Further the types of crosslinks formed are not recited in the instant claims. The claims recite the colloids are absorbed on the particles and make no mention of cross-links. "Absorbed" also encompasses "coat". As previously asserted in the previous office action in regard to the method of making the colloidal system, the instant disclosure teaches several ways to make the colloidal systems of the instant claims (see page 7 of the instant specification). It appears not all of the methods of making the product of the instant claims required an initial acidic solution in order to make the compositions of the instant claims. Further, the product of the instant claims and the product of the combined reference have the same function as being used in an oral composition and restoring dental enamel. The prior art product appears to differ from the claim product only in the method of obtaining the product. The burden of persuasion is on Applicant to show that the claimed product exhibits unexpected properties compared with that of the prior art. See MPEP 2144.04. Although Applicant asserts a material with different properties is yielded from the procedures of the instant claims than what is taught in the combination of references, there appears to be no evidence to support that the compositions have different properties provided in the instant disclosure or the filed Declarations. Note that the burden is higher for applicant due to the "peculiar nature" of product by process claims, as discussed therein.

Declarations by Christian Kropf

The Declarations were discussed in the Final Office Action mailed January 7, 2009.

Claims 8, 9, 13-16 and 20-25 are rejected.

No claims allowed.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Application/Control Number: 09/868,379 Page 5

Art Unit: 1612

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEZAH W. ROBERTS whose telephone number is (571)272-1071. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick F. Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/868,379 Page 6

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lezah W Roberts/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612